

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 4 are amended, claims 2, 3, 5-9 are amended for further clarity and consistency, and claims 10-15 are canceled. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at Fig. 7 and related descriptions in the specification. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida (U.S. Pat. No. 5,172,246) and claims 2, 5, 9, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Beikirch (U.S. Pat. No. 5,532,839). By this amendment, claims 10-15 are canceled and the rejection of claims 1-9 is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida and Beikirch, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a storage device provided in a control device that stores a work flow having a plurality of execution rules for the predetermined series of processes, a rule creation and management device provided in the control device that creates a plurality of error handling and recovery rules for the workflow, and a controller provided in the control device that, for each process of the predetermined series of processes, determines if an error occurs on the document data by comparing process execution with the error handling and recovery rules, updates the execution rules based on the error handling and recovery rules, and requests reexecution of a process in which the error occurs in accordance to the updated execution rules, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 4.

Yoshida discloses the retransmission of the error data frame between a transmitting station and a receiving station. See col. 5, lines 59-64 and Fig. 1 of Yoshida. Initially, Applicants assert that a complete transmitting and receiving of image data cannot be interpreted as a process as recited in the independent claims, otherwise Yoshida fails to

disclose a predetermined series of processes as recited in independent claims. Additionally, Applicants assert that neither the transmitting of image data at a transmitting station nor the receiving of image data at a receiving station alone can be interpreted as the recited process. Although in the applied reference, the damaged frame of transmitted image data can be identified, the transmitting station and the receiving station still cannot determine if an error occurred within a specific process based on predetermined error handling and recovery rules based solely on checking CRC errors. The applied reference simply knows that a segment of the data did not arrive at the desired location.

Further, if the combination of transmitting and receiving of a data frame together is interpreted as the recited process, the *transmitting station* in Yoshida allegedly controls the predetermined work flow regarding transmitting the image data on a frame-by-frame basis. The *receiving station* is responsible for checking CRC errors in received data frames and sending the ID of the damaged data frame to the transmitting station. See col. 5, lines 47-66 of Yoshida. However, under this interpretation, Yoshida does not disclose or suggest a storage device provided in a control device that stores a work flow of the predetermined series of processes, and a controller provided in the control device that, for each process of the predetermined series of processes, determines if an error occurs on the document data by comparing the process execution with predetermined error handling and recovery rules, updates the execution rules based on the error encountered, and requests reexecution of the process in which the error occurred in accordance with the updated execution rules, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 4.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Beikirch fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Yoshida. In particular, Beikirch merely discloses a digital imaging document handling system that identifies duplicate electronic documents without pixel-by-pixel page image comparisons. See col. 1, lines 6-12. However, Beikirch is silent

regarding a predetermined series of processes on document data through cooperation among the processes over a network, let alone the above-noted features.

In view of the above, Yoshida and Beikirch, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter as recited in independent claims 1 and 4, which are therefore allowable. Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 5-9 depend from independent claim 4. Therefore claims 2-3 and 5-9 also define allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and claims 2, 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Benjamin B. Mazahery
Registration No. 60,969

JAO:BBM/tbm

Date: October 10, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461